

Hymns to Hanover: Presbyterians, the Pretender and the failure of the '45

JEFFREY STEPHEN, M.A., Ph.D.

Responding to Charles Edward Stuart's claim to be the master of Scotland, one of his Whig contemporaries insisted, "that is only true in this sense, that hitherto there is no force sufficient to drive you out. But the Hearts of the Country are not yours, nor is the greater part of it subject to your obedience".¹ To a dynasty that boasted a succession stretching back through centuries of Scottish monarchs to the legendary Fergus, the suggestion that Scottish hearts no longer belonged to them must have hurt. Nevertheless, the Prince could not have been oblivious to what was apparent to his contemporaries, that the Stuarts led a diminishing band of followers. In the former Jacobite heartlands of north-east Scotland the decline in support between the '15 and the '45 was obvious to one minister who commented that despite the noise they made about their strength, it was nothing when compared with 1715.² This decline suggests a deep-seated reappraisal brought about by a combination of factors.³ Not least of these factors was religion. The

¹ William Grant Lord Prestongrange, *An answer to the second manifesto of the pretender's eldest son, which bears the date at the palace of Holy-Rood House the 10th day of October 1745, containing reflections political and historical, upon the late revolution and the progress of the present rebellion in Scotland* (London, 1746), 24; *Historical papers relating to the Jacobite period 1699–1750*, ed. James Allardyce, 2 vols. (Aberdeen, 1895–1896), i, 188. For background reading on Jacobitism and the '45 see, D. Szechi, *The Jacobites, Britain and Europe, 1688–1788* (Manchester, 1994); Jeremy Black, *Culloden and the '45* (Sutton, 1990); Christopher Duffy, *The '45* (London, 2003); Murray G. H. Pittock, *Jacobitism* (London, 1998).

² "Memoirs of the Rebellion in 1745 and 1746, so far as it Concerned the Counties of Aberdeen and Banff", in *Origins of the Forty-Five, and other papers relating to that rising*, ed. Walter B. Laikie (Edinburgh, 1916), 130.

³ Margaret Sankey & Daniel Szechi, "Elite Culture and the Decline of Scots Jacobitism, 1716–1745", *Past and Present*, clxxiii (Oxford, 2001), 90–128.

north-eastern lowlands of Scotland had been predominately episcopalian in 1689 and as such, loyal to the Stuarts. Non-juring episcopalianism has been described as, "the sacramental cement of Scottish Jacobitism".⁴ However, ecclesiastically, the north-east was a very different place in 1745; it was predominately presbyterian and presbyterianism was synonymous with anti-Jacobitism. Even in the Highlands where presbyterianism had made relatively slow progress, it appeared that in those areas where it had influence, few came out for the Prince.⁵ This change has not been fully recognised when discussing Jacobite support where the tendency has been to emphasise episcopalian strength while ignoring its decline.⁶

An important factor, which is often overlooked, was that not all episcopalians were non-juring Jacobites. Thus the failure to appreciate the progress of presbyterianism has resulted in dubious claims about the strength of Jacobitism.⁷ Notwithstanding those incumbents who took advantage of the opportunity to rejoin the established church, in the years following the revolution the established church made steady

⁴ Allan I. Macinnes, "Jacobitism in Scotland: Episodic Cause or National Movement?", *The Scottish Historical Review*, lxxvi (2007), 225-252 (235). The relationship between episcopalianism and Jacobitism has been well documented and is fully discussed in the following, Bruce Lenman, "The Scottish episcopal Clergy and the Ideology of Jacobitism", in *Ideology and Conspiracy: Aspects of Jacobitism, 1689-1759*, ed. Eveline Cruickshanks (Edinburgh, 1982); D.H. Whiteford, "Jacobitism as a factor in presbyterian-episcopalian Relationships in Scotland", *Records of the Scottish Church History Society*, 16 (1967), 129-149; D.H. Whiteford, "Jacobitism as a factor in presbyterian-episcopalian Relationships in Scotland. The Afflicted Church", *Records of the Scottish Church History Society*, 16 (1968), 185-201.

⁵ "Memorial Concerning the Highlands", in *Origins of the Forty-Five, and other papers relating to that rising*, ed. Walter B. Laikie (Edinburgh, 1916).

⁶ Murray G.H. Pittock, *The Myth of the Jacobite Clans* (Edinburgh, 1995), 46-48.

⁷ John S. Gibson, *Playing the Scottish Card, The Franco-Jacobite Invasion of 1708* (Edinburgh, 1988), 46; Pittock, *The Myth of the Jacobite Clans*, 47-8.

progress in the north-east in terms of occupying parishes.⁸ Despite the influence of episcopalian heritors and the actions of the rabble, it was difficult for episcopalians to maintain their position and the lost clergy were steadily replaced by presbyterians.⁹ The established church had the benefit of significant post-revolution parliamentary legislation and was ably assisted by the privy council until its dissolution in 1708. Those episcopalians still in possession of their churches at the outbreak of the '15 were relatively small in number and rewarded for their Jacobitism with a swift ejection in its aftermath.¹⁰ During the thirty years between the '15 and the '45, the church consolidated its position. While some of the episcopal laity followed their ministers to meeting houses, it appears that most people were content to stay in the parish church with the presbyterian minister. A further drift away from episcopacy by the laity occurred as a result of the internecine struggles amongst the clergy over

⁸ Hew Scott, *Fasti Ecclesiae Scoticae, The Succession of Ministers in the Church of Scotland from the Reformation*, 8 vols. (Edinburgh, 1915-1950), vi, The synods of Aberdeen and Moray. A number of factors account for the gradual decline in the numbers of those who remained in possession of their churches, whether under the protection of the law or not. Some of the dispossessed clergy set up meeting houses, others like James Gordon took up positions in England, or as chaplains and tutors to aristocratic patrons, and inevitably many died. See *James Gordon's Diary 1692-1710*, edd. G.D. Henderson & H.H. Porter (Aberdeen, 1949); Lenman, "The Scottish Episcopal Clergy", 41, 44-45.

⁹ *The Correspondence of Robert Wodrow*, ed. Thomas M'Crie, 3 vols. (Edinburgh, 1842), i, 216, 278; National Library of Scotland [NLS], Wodrow Quarto LXXXII, fos.30-41. Rev. John Bell of Gladsmuir in the Presbytery of Haddington gives an extensive account of efforts to replace a conforming episcopalian, who had died in Haddington in 1702, with a presbyterian.

¹⁰ National Archives of Scotland [NAS], CH2/103/8, 39-51. For example of the process of deposition of four episcopal incumbents within the Presbytery of Dundee; Frederick Goldie, *A Short History of the Episcopal Church in Scotland from the Restoration to the present time* (London, 1951), 43-4; Alistair and Henrietta Tayler, *Jacobites of Aberdeenshire and Banffshire in the Rising of 1715* (Edinburgh, 1934), 218-45.

liturgical usage and innovation.¹¹ The cumulative effect of this was that “During the fifty-five years since the Revolution, years of persecution and dissension, the numbers of clergy and people had steadily diminished”. Frederick Goldie estimated that on the eve of the ’45 there was less than one hundred and fifty clergy in communion with the Scottish bishops across the whole of Scotland.¹² Furthermore, according to Gavin White, those bishops, “remained cool to the pretender from the day of his landing,” and their, “Jacobite loyalty was already more theological than political”.¹³

This transformation in religious affiliation could not fail to have a detrimental impact on recruitment and support. Even the most optimistic assessment of Jacobite strength in the north-eastern lowlands during the ’45 cannot hide the general decline.¹⁴ Not only was it the case that despite the charisma, drama and early successes of the ’45, “a significantly lower proportion of the potential pool of sympathizers felt able to take up arms once again”.¹⁵ But it was also the case that the potential pool from which that support could be drawn, had also been significantly reduced. Presbyterianism’s strategic successes, combined with its inherent anti-Jacobitism and social influence guaranteed long before the ’45 that the battle for hearts and minds was one the Prince could not win.

When the Prince arrived in Scotland asserting his father’s “undoubted Right to the Throne of his Ancestors”, presbyterians asked who was suing him for redress?

¹¹ Andrew L. Drummond & James Bulloch, *The Scottish Church 1688-1843*, (Edinburgh, 1973), 21-23, 27-29.

¹² Goldie, *A Short History of the Episcopal Church*, 55-6.

¹³ Gavin White, *The Scottish Episcopal Church: A New History* (Edinburgh, 1998).

¹⁴ Pittock, *The Myth of the Jacobite Clans*, 58.

¹⁵ Sankey & Szecchi, “Elite Culture and the Decline of Scots Jacobitism, 1716-1745”, 126.

Was he invited over by the voice of the Nation? Is it from a Spirit of Liberty that he comes at the invitation of a few, to conquer and enslave the rest? Or now that he has come, do the Asserters of liberty entertain him?¹⁶

Regardless of denomination, presbyterians refused to entertain him and remained loyal, enthusiastic supporters and defenders of the "illustrious" House of Hanover.¹⁷ Throughout the crisis their loyalty and actions were widely recognised and applauded. The Duke of Cumberland expressed his appreciation, "of the very steady and laudable conduct of the clergy", displayed through the whole course of the rebellion.¹⁸ In London the Kirk was lauded for the loyalty and zeal of its ministers, with one bishop expressing the view that "they had behaved wonderfully well, and some of them like true heroes".¹⁹ True heroes!! High praise indeed, from a bishop, who even suggested that some kind of public acknowledgement should be made of the church's efforts. Only three ministers contrived to have their loyalty called into

¹⁶ Andrew, Richardson, *A free and arbitrary government compared in two sermons. The first preached in the church of Broughton, on Wednesday the 18th of December 1745: being the day appointed by the King for a general fast on account of the present rebellion and the second preached in the same place* (Edinburgh, 1746), 21.

¹⁷ This paper does not attempt to claim that no presbyterian ever supported the Jacobites. Individuals clearly did. The Prince's chief officer, Lord George Murray was a presbyterian as was John Cameron, one of Lochiel's chaplains. The synod of Angus and Mearns issued a call for presbytery reports about any elders, schoolmasters, session clerks, precentors and other church officers who were involved in the '15, clearly implying that there were such individuals. NAS, CH2/154/6, 308. However, such individuals were few and far between and, as Allan Macinnes has pointed out, those from the Highlands were committed as much by clanship as religious affiliation. Macinnes, "Jacobitism in Scotland", 236, footnote.

¹⁸ *Acts of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland 1638-1842* (Edinburgh, 1843), 690.

¹⁹ Historical Manuscripts Commission, *Laing*, 2 vols. (London, 1925), ii, 368-9, Dr John Mitchell to Professor Charles Mackie, 17 May 1746.

question. Two were acquitted while the third received a six-month suspension from office; a clerical slap on the wrist.²⁰ Presbyterians proved themselves to be a bulwark against Jacobitism. Their loyalty was expressed in pro-active opposition to the Prince, particularly evident during the period when the government's political and military apparatus in Scotland had collapsed, a circumstance described by one Edinburgh Whig as a stain on British history.²¹ At that point the church, through pulpit and press, was the voice of opposition in Scotland. Efforts to win them over were beyond the powers of even this charismatic prince. It has rightly been said that ministers, "compiled an impressive record of defiance towards the Jacobites in 1745-6".²² This paper will examine that record and the principles behind it.

Anti-unionism, 1708 and the '15

The Prince should not have been surprised by the Kirk's opposition. Fifty-five years may have passed since the Revolution but as long as there was a threat from the Stuarts the hostility towards them would not diminish. The Stuarts were still a merciless and perfidious race lurking in the bosom of the nation; still the "composition of all Evil, who would at once deprive us of all those Blessings, and bring upon us All this

²⁰ John Grant of Urquhart, Stuart, minister in the Isle of Bute, and Thomas Man, minister at Dunkeld. Grant was transported to Tilbury Fort and subsequently acquitted of all charges. Stuart appeared before his presbytery and was similarly acquitted. Thomas Man was found guilty by the Commission of the General Assembly of having omitted to pray for the king and royal family by name and of having drunk the health of the pretender and received a six months suspension from office. See *The history of the rebellion in the years 1745 and 1746. From a manuscript now in the possession of Lord James Stewart-Murray*, ed. Henrietta Tayler (Oxford, 1944), 345-47; *Origins of the Forty-Five, and other papers relating to that rising*, ed. Walter B. Laikie (Edinburgh, 1916).

²¹ *The Woodhouselee Manuscript. A narrative of events in Edinburgh and district during the Jacobite occupation, September to November 1745*, ed. Archibald F. Stewart (London, 1907), 89.

²² Bob Harris, "Jacobitism", in *Modern Scottish History, 1707 to the Present*, edd. Anthony Cooke *et al.* (East Linton, 1998), 28.

Misery". What future for Scotland if they prevailed? "Farewell Freedom and Liberty of Conscience; farewell the peaceable possession of the Sanctuary, farewell the pure Religion of Jesus; farewell all the inestimable Privileges of the late happy Revolution, the Purchase of so much Treasure and Blood".²³ The Revolution, regarded by Jacobites as unlawful, was the reason for the '45 and all previous attempts to force a restoration.²⁴ Just as his father had done in 1743, the Prince offered a free and full pardon for all treasons, rebellions and offences committed against his grandfather, his father and himself; presbyterians would be forgiven for their revolution if they helped him overturn it.²⁵ However, as supporters and beneficiaries of the Revolution, presbyterians had an obvious interest in maintaining it. Nor had they forgotten the outrageous persecution suffered under Charles II and James VII & II. The presbyterian ghosts of the "Killing Times" were still being marshalled against Stuart tyranny.

The battle for hearts and minds had traditionally focused on appealing to presbyterian enmity towards incorporating union with England. However, presbyterians were never persuaded to support a "Popish Pretender" they disliked more than the union. Anti-unionism was not synonymous with Jacobitism; a point it seems the Jacobites were reluctant to accept, a reluctance verging on gullibility. Indeed, gullible is the most appropriate term to describe the Jacobite agents who accepted assurances from John Ker of Kersland prior to the 1708 invasion, that he could raise 8000 disaffected presbyterians, 5000 of

²³ Alexander Webster, *Heathens professing Judaism, when the fear of the Jews fell upon them, the substance of two sermons preached in the Tolbooth church in Edinburgh, on occasion of the thanksgiving June 23, 1746, appointed by the late General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, for the victory obtained over the rebels at the battle of Culloden, April 16, 1746* (Edinburgh, 1746), 24.

²⁴ James Garden, *Reasons for appointing and observing a day of solemn fasting and humiliation, to be read from the pulpit after the end of divine service on the Lord's Day immediately preceeding, by the several ministers to whose hand this comes* (1715).

²⁵ Allardyce, *Historical Papers*, i, 182-4.

which were Cameronians. What else could explain their belief that the staunchest upholders of Scotland's covenanted reformation, who were the first to advocate armed resistance to the Stuarts, would now help to restore them? Or just as implausibly that in return for their help they wanted "King James" to let a free parliament decide for either presbytery or episcopacy as well as secure liberty of conscience for Catholics.²⁶ Ker's fiction was further evident in his claim to have helped the Cameronians write their anti-union address, delivered at Sanquhar on 2 October 1707. According to Ker, the address was a response to Jacobite requests for evidence of Cameronian disaffection to union and their readiness to rise and that it was written so as to "make the Jacobites hope that the Cameronians might soon be reconciled to that interest".²⁷ The document was in fact an emphatic rejection of the pretender that insisted the Stuarts had no right to rule in the three kingdoms because of their, "stated opposition to God and our covenanted work of reformation".²⁸

²⁶ *Correspondence of Colonel N Hooke, agent from the Court of France to the Scottish Jacobites in the years 1703-1707*, ed. William D. Maeray, 2 vols. (London, 1870-1871), ii, 308-13. A free parliament had established presbytery at the revolution but the settlement was rejected by Cameronians as erastian.

²⁷ John Ker, *Memoirs of John Ker of Kersland* (1727), 46-53.

²⁸ *The Protestation and testimony of the United Societies of the witnessing remnant of the anti-Popish, anti-Prelatic, anti-Erastian, anti-Sectarian, true presbyterian Church in Scotland, against the sinful incorporating Union with England and their British Parliament, concluded and established, May, 1707* (Sanquhar, 1707). A letter he claimed to have received from them in October 1709 in which they highlighted their readiness to oppose the French invasion of the previous year illustrated the contradictory nature of Ker's claims regarding the Cameronians. The letter is undoubtedly a forgery by Ker, a seam designed to secure money from Robert Harley, supposedly to pay the Cameronians arrears for services rendered at the revolution but in reality Ker intended the money for himself. See *Historical Manuscripts Commission, Fifteenth Report, Appendix, Part IV, The Manuscripts of The Duke of Portland, IV* (London, 1897). 528-9. Cameronian denials of Jacobite tendencies were prompted more by inter-denominational presbyterian politics than any substance to the accusations. See Matthew

The invasion attempt in 1708 was the Jacobite response to union. Efforts were made to tempt presbyterians with promises to secure presbytery and in a reference to the arguments over intrinsic power, it was promised that general assemblies would be free and “shall not have commissioners to overawe them or ajurne them”.²⁹ Presbyterians had never associated the Stuarts with spiritual independence and were not going to start. Thus it was reported that despite being ill affected towards the union they were not so desperate as to join, “with the French popish party to the overthrow of religion and liberties and all dear to men”.³⁰ Daniel Williams, a Welsh presbyterian minister based in London, was not concerned about presbyterians joining the pretender but hoped that notwithstanding their resentments about union they would be proactive rather than neutral. If the Jacobites were defeated without the assistance of the church, “suspicion will fall on you beyond your vindication”. Williams was sure that ministers were well aware of the consequences of the pretender’s success and that history had taught them that the Stuarts were not to be trusted, “you cannot be safe many days after they have power, conscience can find no pretence for neutrality....”³¹

In March 1708 the Commission of the General Assembly called for a national fast in response to the threat and used the strongest possible terms to express their loyalty to Queen Anne and the government and

Hutchinson, *The Reformed Presbyterian Church in Scotland* (Paisley, 1893), 163; *Plain Reasons for presbyterians Dissenting from the Revolution Church in Scotland* (1731), 275; *A Converse between Two Presbyterians of the Established Church An Elder and a Preacher. Wherein the Presbyterian Dissenters from the Established Church, are vindicate from the charge of Jacobitism* (1714), 2-12. In 1714, the Cameronians sent a list of grievances to King George I promising their loyalty and support if they were redressed, sec, NAS, CH3/269/3, 114-121.

²⁹ NAS, GD220/5/152.

³⁰ *Seafield Correspondence from 1685 to 1708*, ed. James Grant (Edinburgh, 1912), James Stewart, Lord Advocate to Earl of Seafield, 6 & 16 March 1708; Rev. John Stirling to Seafield, 6 March 1708; Magistrates of Glasgow to Seafield, 19 March 1708; Earl of Leven to Seafield, 21 March 1708, 448-67.

³¹ Glasgow University Library [GUL], MS Murray 651, III, No 65, Daniel Williams to Stirling, 13 March 1708.

their utter detestation of French power, and a Popish pretender.³² Discussing the fast with James Ogilvie first Earl of Seafield, William Carstares maintained that its sentiments, “cannot but be a blow to the expectation of Jacobites who did with all industrie as your Lordship knows improve the dissatisfaction that some presbyterians had with the union to the advantage of their designs”. According to Carstares, some of the ministers most hostile to the union were the most earnest in urging this fast and testifying their loyalty.³³ It was also claimed that the presbyterian reaction to the invasion had served to “un-deceive” the French who had undertaken the expedition on the mistaken grounds that “all the anti-unioners in Scotland are accounted Jacobites”, when in fact presbyterian anti-unionists were as faithful and loyal subjects as “her Majesty has in all her dominions”.³⁴

News of the commission’s proceedings was well received in London, as indeed was the reaction of the church generally. Scots politicians in the city maintained a steady correspondence with leading ministers throughout the crisis. Hugh Campbell, third Earl of Loudon was confident that all the ministers of the church would impress upon their people the danger with which the invasion threatened their religion and liberties.³⁵ Many presbyteries followed the commission’s lead, prompting Carstares to express his satisfaction at the number of addresses being sent to the

³² NAS, CH1/3/9, 251-3; *Historical Manuscripts Commission, Duke of Roxburgh, Sir H.H. Campbell, Earl of Strathmore and the Countess Dowager of Seafield* (London, 1894), 222-3; For the alternative view of presbyterian willingness to support the Stuarts in 1708 see, John S. Gibson, *Playing the Scottish Card*, 81-90.

³³ *HMC Roxburgh*, 222-3.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, 161.

³⁵ GUL, MS Murray 651, III, No 54, Francis Montgomery to John Stirling, 13 March 1708; No 55, Lord Loudon to Stirling, 16 March 1708. A number of Stirling’s correspondents in London expressed similar sentiments, see, GUL, MS Murray 651, III, No 58, Francis Montgomery to John Stirling, 27 March 1708; No 59, Seafield to Stirling, 27 March 1708; No 60, David Nairne to Stirling, 1 April 1708. See also Joseph M’Cormick, *State Papers and Letters addressed to William Carstares* (Edinburgh, 1774), 13 March 1708, Earl of Glasgow to Carstares, 764; 27 March 1708, Seafield to Carstares, 765.

Queen. Far more presbyteries addressed against the pretender than had addressed against the union. John Erskine, Earl of Mar, as one of the secretaries of state, had been the recipient of many of them and had informed Anne of the zeal of the church for her government and its aversion to the invasion.³⁶ Apart from seeking a good response from the church, Francis Montgomery's other concern was that the addresses should use the term Great Britain rather than Scotland and England. It was not just a question of reflecting the new political reality but the term would help to counter suggestions that presbyterian hostility to union was likely to throw them into the arms of the pretender against whom the union was regarded as a bulwark.³⁷ Thus when fears of an invasion had subsided, Charles Morthland urged the "honest party in Scotland" to be more united than ever in defence of the union and revolution interest.³⁸

William Carstares busied himself encouraging presbyteries to send addresses and expressed the hope that the presbytery of Glasgow would follow the town in preparing one; he was not disappointed.³⁹ Carstares was a signatory to the address prepared by the presbytery of Edinburgh, which expressed astonishment that any of their countrymen should be so insensible of their own happiness under the present reign and government as to attempt to overthrow it. They had a deep sense of the

³⁶ GUL, MS Murray 651, III, No 56, Mar to Stirling, 16 March 1708; NAS, GD124/15/8/18/1, Letter to the Earl of Mar, concerning loyal addresses to the Queen on the occasion of the threatened invasion by the French. From Mr John McBride, for presbytery of Glasgow. The Earl of Mar was the recipient of 28 such addresses from presbyteries and synods across Scotland, see, GD124/15/818/1-GD124/15/818/28.

³⁷ GUL, MS Murray 651, III, Nos 58 and 62, Montgomery to Stirling, 27 March and 3 April 1708.

³⁸ GUL, MS Murray 651, III, No 64, Charles Morthland to John Stirling, 10 April 1708.

³⁹ GUL, MS Murray 650, I, No 97, William Carstares to John Stirling, 18 March 1708. The town had applied to the privy council to be allowed to muster men in arms for self defence and to suppress any invasion force. See, GUL, MS Murray 651, III, No 57, Francis Montgomery to John Stirling, 20 March 1708.

misery that would accompany the success of an invasion and expressed their relief at the news that it had failed.⁴⁰

The synod of Fife, similarly reflected that the, "late pernicious attempt of a popish pretender, supported by the great and declared enemy of the protestant religion and the liberties of Europe", brought forth feelings of deep detestation. The synod expressed its relief that the religious liberties happily restored at the never to be forgotten revolution, had been providentially preserved, "while we were upon the brink of falling into all the miseries which could follow upon the irruption of a bloody foreign enemy, and the rebellious insurrection of such ill affected and unnatural countrymen as were waiting to join them". The synod expressed its collective loyalty to Anne and declared its intention to do its utmost to, "excite all under our inspection to appear for, and contribute their utmost to the support of your majesties government and Protestant succession".⁴¹

Securing and supporting the Protestant succession had always been a concern for the church. An open succession had worrying implications and the church welcomed the settlement on the House of Hanover, even if many were unhappy that it was within the context of an incorporating union.⁴² An unwelcome consequence of union for the church was the toleration act of 1712, a complication of which was the requirement for all clergymen to subscribe an oath of abjuration. The oath split the

⁴⁰ NAS, CH2/121/6, Presbytery of Edinburgh, 25 March 1708, 358-9.

⁴¹ NAS, CH2/154/6, Synod of Fife, 7 April 1708, 62.

⁴² A circular letter from the commission in August 1704, called for a day of prayer and humiliation in which people were urged to, "stand in the gap and wrestle ... for the church and nation ... that we may be preserved from a popish successor to the crown". *Historical Manuscripts Commission Report on the Manuscripts of the Duke of Portland*, VIII (London, 1907), 142. Monetary Letter from the Commission of the General Assembly, 8 August 1706. Some like William Carstares favoured an incorporating union because it appeared to offer the best means of securing the Protestant succession, *Historical Manuscripts Commission Report on the Manuscripts of the Earl of Mar and Kellie* (London, 1904), 250-251, 256. William Carstares to Earl of Mar, 2 March 1706 and 19 March 1706.

church into two camps: jurors and non-jurors. The non-jurors refused because the oath contained a reference to the English act that the sovereign should always be in communion with the Church of England. They also regarded the imposition of the oath as an infringement upon their spiritual independence and a breach of the union. Their hostility to the oath left them open to charges of Jacobitism.

James Webster, who had been a leading opponent of the union, denounced the oath in a series of sermons in Edinburgh. He was reported as having said that, "For his own part, he said he would rather go with his wife and family to the utmost part of the earth and have but one meal a day, than take it". It was also said that the Jacobites are so well pleased with Webster's sermons, "that they never drink King James's health but they drink Mr Webster's health after it".⁴³ Non-jurors responded to the charges with declarations of loyalty, "almost in the very words of the oath".⁴⁴

The synod of Glasgow and Ayr addressed Anne with expressions of loyalty and support for the Hanoverian succession.⁴⁵ Lord Islay who presented it at court commented that the scruples of ministers appeared ridiculous to the English but, "the expressions in favour of the Protestant succession please more people here than our Jacobites imagine".⁴⁶ At Edinburgh on 6 November 1712, Robert Livingston minister at Biggar presented a declaration of loyalty to the synod of Lothian and Tweeddale on behalf of twenty-nine non-juring ministers. Designed to, "prevent all misconstructions which may possibility be entertained of our not taking the said oath", it denounced the pretender and expressed their, "resolve through grace, in our stations to Maintain, Defend and Support the Succession to the Crown in the Illustrious

⁴³ *The Correspondence of Robert Wodrow*, i, 163-4.

⁴⁴ *The Declaration of Loyalty of the Ministers of the Established Church of Scotland, who had not the Freedom to take the Oath of Abjuration: With the whole Proceedings thereon, dated at Edinburgh, November 15. 1712* (Edinburgh, 1712), 4.

⁴⁵ NAS, CH2/464/2, Synod of Glasgow and Ayr, 9 October 1712, 298-301; GUL, MS Murray 650-651, vol. 3, No 155, John Stirling to Islay, 11 October 1712.

⁴⁶ GUL, MS Murray 650-651, vol. 3, No 15. Islay to John Stirling 1 November 1712.

Family of Hanover". The Protestant succession was identified as a bulwark against popery and tyranny and they insisted their refusal to take the oath was not out of disloyalty or disobedience to authority.⁴⁷ Concerned about the potential for division, the commission issued a resolution on 6 December 1712 in which it urged peace and unity among ministers and that they would, "do their utmost to discourage and disappoint all designs and attempts by popish and other Jacobite emissaries and to confirm and establish the people in their loyalty to the queen, aversion to the pretender and zeal for and affection towards the Protestant succession".⁴⁸ These anti-Jacobite and pro-Hanoverian sentiments were reinforced when the commission published its *Seasonable Warning* the following year.⁴⁹

The accession of George I in 1714, took place amid a sustained campaign to dissolve the union. Patronage, toleration and the abjuration oath had done nothing to endear the union to presbyterians. While Robert Wodrow was confident the bulk of Scots would acknowledge that it was perfectly reasonable to seek dissolution, he was also "very unwilling" to take any action that might prove detrimental to the Hanoverian succession and beneficial to the Jacobites.⁵⁰ The perception that the Jacobites were behind the anti-union agitation was enough to persuade presbyterians to avoid it. Non-juring presbyterians were specifically targeted on the grounds that their refusal to take the oath implied greater hostility to the union and sympathy for the pretender. It was hoped that whatever their objections to the union, ministers would be wise enough, "to discern the snare that is laid for them by the common enemy".⁵¹

⁴⁷ *The Declaration of Loyalty of the Ministers of the Established Church of Scotland*, 5.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, 11-12.

⁴⁹ *A Seasonable Warning by the Commission of the General Assembly Concerning the Danger of Popery* (Edinburgh, 1713).

⁵⁰ *The Correspondence of Robert Wodrow*, i, 633-39.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, 633-34; GUL, MS Murray 650-651, vol. 4 No 16, Montrose to Stirling, 25 December 1714.

These sentiments were echoed by the commission. In 1713 it urged Scots to consider that whatever the inconveniences and dangerous consequences of the union to their civil interests or the grievances of the church under it, to expect a remedy from the pretender was a, "gross delusion, and a bait which we cannot think will catch any, but such as are very simple and credulous". The commission maintained that there were no grounds to expect that the pretender would dissolve the union if he was successful.⁵² The following year presbyterians were warned against producing an address calling for a dissolution on the grounds that it would further the Stuart agenda without ending the union. Jacobites were not so concerned about dissolving the union as they pretended to be. They only hated it because it excluded the Stuarts from the succession and if they could secure a restoration, "they have their end; and I am afraid there is too much ground to think, that they would be willing to continue under the Union providing they could get back their Popish pretender".⁵³

⁵² *A Seasonable Warning by the Commission of the General Assembly*; In 1713, following a series of perceived national grievances culminating in the Malt Tax, Scottish members of parliament narrowly failed to introduce a bill for dissolving the union. Calls for a dissolution of the union persisted in Scotland until the accession of George I. *Reasons for Dissolving the Treaty of Union betwixt Scotland and England; in a Letter to a Scots Member of Parliament from one of his Electors* (1713); *Union and No Union. Being an Enquiry into the Grievances of the Scots. And how far they are right or wrong who alledge that the union is dissolved* (London, 1713); *A letter from a Lover of his Country, Showing our present Duty, if we would live in Hopes of seeing the Union dissolved* (Edinburgh, 1714); *The History of the National Address for Dissolving the Union. By a Scotchman.* (London, 1715). *An Historical Account of the Union betwixt the Egyptians and Israelites* (1715); *A Discourse of the Necessity and Seasonableness of an unanimous Address for Dissolving the Union* (1715); *The Declaration, Protestation and Testimony of a poor wasted, desolate, misrepresented and reproached remnant of the True Presbyterian Church of Christ in Scotland; Published against the Proclamation, accession and establishment of George D. of Hanover to be the King in these lands* (1715).

⁵³ *A letter from a Lover of his Country. Showing our present Duty, if we would live in Hopes of seeing the Union dissolved* (Edinburgh, 1714), 5.

Fear of being involved in an action that might benefit the Jacobites did not deter all presbyterians. The presbytery of Dunfermline drew up an address to King George I representing their grievances, including the union. Ralph Erskine, minister at Dunfermline, composed a congratulatory poem to the king that simultaneously expressed thanks for his accession, abjured the pretender and called for the redressing of their grievances over toleration, patronage, the abjuration oath and the union.

But that which sums up all our sins in one,
Is, that the Babel-Union be o'er thrown.
A corporation which we still bewail,
While England is the Head and we the Tail.
This Matrimonial Contract was so forced,
We'll ne'er agree, until we be divorced.⁵⁴

One writer argued that dissolving the union did not necessarily mean opening the door for the pretender. The Hanoverian succession could be secure under the kind of constitutional relationship that pre-existed union. He insisted that the power of the Church party in a British parliament was too great for the Scots to overcome and that the church was likely to be safer in the hands of a Scottish parliament. He urged ministers to think carefully about whether or not they should risk their reputations by opposing such a national concern.⁵⁵ For Robert Wodrow the dilemma was exacerbated by his conviction that the restoration of Scotland's parliament would not necessarily remove the church's

⁵⁴ Ralph Erskine, *A Congratulatory Poem upon the Coronation of His Majesty King George with Dunfermline's Address to His Majesty for Redressing Scotland's Grievances* (1714); *The Declaration, Protestation and Testimony of a poor wasted, desolate, misrepresented and reproached remnant of the True Presbyterian Church of Christ in Scotland; Published against the Proclamation, accession and establishment of George D of Hanover to be the King in these lands* (1715).

⁵⁵ *The History of the National Address for Dissolving the Union. By a Scotchman* (London, 1715), 8.

grievances because, “had we a Scots parliament, I do not well know but they may lay us under the same, if not greater burdens, than these”.⁵⁶

Historians have consistently argued that union was a political gift for the Jacobites because anti-unionism was the prime motivating factor behind the attempted invasion of 1708 and the rising in 1715.⁵⁷ That it allowed the Stuarts to become the self-appointed guardians of Scottish nationalist sentiment is not in doubt and it is evident from the events between 1707 and 1716 that Stuart anti-unionism galvanised their supporters. However, the evidence is unequivocal that those who were not among their natural supporters were unimpressed. Jacobite efforts to exploit presbyterian hostility to the union and attempts to win their support by playing the nationalist, anti-union card were a complete failure.⁵⁸ Presbyterians consistently warned against the Jacobite threat and used every opportunity to denounce the pretender in the strongest possible terms. As for the anti-unionism at the heart of the '15, the synod of Glasgow and Ayr accurately reflected the sentiments of the wider church when it expressed the hope that,

the rebels pretence of making us easie as to the grievance of the union, can never take with thinking people, who consider that some of the chief leaders were principal contrivers and promoters of it: And when essays were made to have redress in a parliamentary way, so as the Protestant Succession might be secured, they

⁵⁶ *The Correspondence of Robert Wodrow*, i, 639.

⁵⁷ Bruce Lenman, *The Jacobite Risings in Britain 1689-1746* (London, 1980), 87; T.M. Devine, *The Scottish Nation* (London, 1999), 36-7; Christopher A. Whatley, *The Scots and the Union* (Edinburgh, 2006), 14-15, 323, 339-43; Macinnes, “Jacobitism in Scotland”, 232, 239.

⁵⁸ Despite their experiences and all the evidence to the contrary, as late as 1726 the Jacobites were still living in the hope of an alliance with the Cameronians. See *Letters of George Lockhart of Carnwath, 1698-1732*, ed. Daniel Szechi (Edinburgh, 1989), 245, 255-6.

themselves defeat the design. And it's notour from their conduct that the great thing in the union grievous to them, is the establishment of the Protestant Succession in his Majesty's family, upon which the security of all our valuable rights depends.⁵⁹

In 1745 royal proclamations declaring an end to the "pretended union" were similarly dismissed.⁶⁰ John Bisset, minister in Aberdeen, expressed his disaffection for many things in the union but acknowledged and welcomed the fact that it acted as a bulwark against a Stuart restoration.⁶¹ Attacking Jacobite nationalism in a fast-day sermon, George Wishart of the Tron Church in Edinburgh said that there was a certain kind of spirit, which leads people to prefer a whimsical and imaginary glory of their country, to the most solid public advantages. Defending the union, and reflecting an increasing perception in Scotland that the benefits of union were becoming more apparent, Wishart claimed that the rebels were willing to exchange the "happy situation" and the "substantial blessings of a Free government which we now enjoy", for the "imaginary honour of their country", the

⁵⁹ *Admonition by the synod of Glasgow and Air, to all the congregations under their inspection* (Glasgow, 1715).

⁶⁰ In light of his comment that "whatever may be hereafter devised for the joint benefit of both Nations, the King will most readily comply with and request of his Parliaments to establish", it is highly questionable if he intended to end the union upon a successful conclusion to his campaign. He was well aware that it made political, economic and military sense to maintain the union under the Stuarts. See Jeffrey Stephen, "Scottish Nationalism and Stuart Unionism: The Edinburgh Council, 1745", in *Journal of British Studies* 49 (January 2010), 47-72.

⁶¹ "Extracts from the Diary of the Reverend John Bisset minister at Aberdeen", in *The Miscellany of the Spalding Club*, I, ed. John Stuart (Aberdeen, 1841), 367.

consequences of which would be to render the nation the slaves and dependents of a foreign power.⁶²

One group of presbyterians maintained that no benefits likely to accrue from the dissolution of the union could outweigh the likely fatal consequences to their religion. Scotland was reaping "real advantages" by the union and even those hostile to it might consider whether at this time its dissolution would not be, "in our present circumstances a real injury even to Scotland", in which case no worthy member of any society would sacrifice the general good of the nation for their own particular interest.⁶³ John Willison from Dundee blamed the union for the rise of infidelity, heresy and popery generally and the chief source of schism, theological declension and patronage in the church. However, he insisted that the disadvantages of union were overshadowed by its benefits, in particular the "British" constitution, its laws and liberties. More importantly, gospel worship and the opportunity to observe it with freedom of conscience, was of greater value than material prosperity and worth every effort taken to preserve it. Threatened by this unnatural rebellion, he asked, "How can any

⁶² George Wishart, *Being the substance of some Sermons preach'd in the Tron Church of Edinburgh in the month of November, 1745 on occasion of the Present Rebellion* (London, 1745); Devine, *The Scottish Nation*, 47; Linda Colley, *Britons Forging the Nation 1707-1837* (Yale, 1992), 71-85; *An Expostulatory Address to the Nobility and Freeholders of Scotland, Shewing the Monstrous Folly as Well as Ingratitude of the Present Unnatural Rebellion, and the Intended Dissolution of the Union, by Arguments drawn from the antient Constitution and present Situation of that Kingdom* (London, 1745), 44-52.

⁶³ *An Antidote against the Infectious Contagion of Popery and Tyranny, humbly offered in An Admonitory Letter from a Presbyterian Society in Edinburgh, to their Friends in Town and Country, touching the present Intestine War* (Edinburgh, 1745), 16-17. Possibly written by the Associate Synod.

British Protestant be easy, or look on the danger with an eye of indifference?"⁶⁴

The Associate synod

Playing the patriotic card proved ineffectual for the Prince; if anything, the rebellion provided those presbyterians most hostile to union, with the perfect opportunity to demonstrate their loyalty to the government. The Associate Synod had begun life in 1733 as a protest against patronage and doctrinal declension when four ministers led by Ebenezer Erskine seceded from the Church of Scotland and formed the Associate Presbytery.⁶⁵ The

⁶⁴ John Willison, *A Fair and Impartial Testimony, Essayed in name of a Number of Ministers, Elders and Christian People of the Church of Scotland, unto The Laudable Principles, Wrestlings and Attainments of that Church, and against the Backslidings, Corruptions, Divisions and Prevailing Evils, both of the former and present times. And namely the Defections of the established Church, of the Nobility, Gentry, Commons, Seceders, Episcopalians, &c. Containing A brief Historical Deduction of the chief Occurrences in this Church from her Beginning to the year 1744, with Remarks; And Humble Pleadings with our Mother, to exert herself to stop Defection, and promote Reformation* (Edinburgh, 1744), 30-41; *Popery: another Gospel: or, A Demonstration that the Romish Religion is not the Gospel that Christ hath left his Church, but what Antchrist hath since devised, to the Destruction of Christianity and the Souls of Men. In Six Sermons from Gal. 1. 8. preached in time of the rebellion anno 1745, and Published to give Warning to all Protestants through Britain and Ireland of the damnable Errors and Cruelty of Popery, and of the dreadful Danger and Tendency of the present Insurrection in its favours, with A preface, relating to the Justice of the Revolution-Principles and present establishment and the unreasonableness of Jacobitism and Disloyalty* (Edinburgh, 1746). Willison expressed similar sentiments in a paper directed at Episcopalians in the aftermath of the 1715 rebellion, see *An apology for the Church of Scotland, against the accusations of prelatists and jacobites, and particularly the reflections of J. S. Late incumbent at Forfar; wherein the said church is fairly vindicated from the unjust charge of schism...;as also the late proceedings of the presbyteries of Angus and other judicatories against the disloyal and rebellious clergy* (1719), 66-81.

⁶⁵ The other three were William Wilson, James Fisher and Alexander Moncrieff. The Associate Presbytery grew in popularity and drew upon a cross section of social

denomination subscribed to the covenants, which were renewed in 1743. They protested against the union as unlawful, inconsistent with the covenants and detrimental to the spiritual health of the nation. Nevertheless, they upheld the government as lawful, acknowledged the civil authorities and consistently supported the Hanoverian succession. They regarded the rebellion was an unwelcome attempt to overthrow their religious liberties but also an opportunity to demonstrate their loyalty to the government and the crown. In 1738, William Kerr, third Marquess of Lothian accused the seceders of encouraging dangerous opinions and disaffection to the government by their preaching.⁶⁶ However, by January 1746 attitudes had changed. Ebenezer Erskine had raised several companies in defence of Stirling amounting to around six hundred men all armed from the castle. Lothian wrote to Erskine offering his son Lord Robert Kerr as their colonel, an offer seen by the seceders as a vindication of their loyalty. Kerr went on to receive heroic status at Culloden where as a captain in Barrel's regiment he was killed in action, "with his spontoon in the heart of a Rebel".⁶⁷

In September 1745 following the Jacobite victory at Prestonpans, the synod appointed a day of prayer and fasting. The rebellion was described as a judgment of God who, "in his righteous displeasure, hath now permitted the whole protestant interest in these lands, and all the valuable liberties thereof, to be actually struck at, and lawfully shaken, by the son of a popish pretender, at the head of a popish and malignant party in this land".⁶⁸ The synod met again in April 1746 to discuss the manner in

groups. By 1740 it had eight ministers and had begun licensing men to preach in order to supply the demand for a growing church. The eight men were formally deposed from the Church of Scotland and by 1745 the church had three presbyteries and called itself the Associate synod.

⁶⁶ Public Record Office [PRO], SP54/23/19A.

⁶⁷ P.C. Yorke, *The Life and Correspondence of Philip Yorke, Earle of Hardwicke, Lord High Chancellor of Great Britain*, 3 vols. (Cambridge, 1913), ii, 519-21; Webster, *Heathens professing Jndaism*, 54.

⁶⁸ John M'Kerrow, *History of the Secession Church* 2 vols. (Edinburgh, 1839), i, 258.

which they should take up arms. While they recognised the necessity of making common cause with the government, they refused to be incorporated in any military capacity with those who did not share their testimony against the corruptions in church and state. They insisted upon separation in military terms just as they did in religious terms. Any militia of seceders had to be led by an officer of their choice, have their own minister, be armed and funded according to acts of parliament, disbanded after six months or after the rebellion was crushed and exempted from taking any military oath.⁶⁹ Discussions about conditions of service proved to be irrelevant as the rebellion was crushed at Culloden before any further action could be taken. However, seceding congregations had been mustering militias since the outbreak of the rebellion and their activities were recognised by Cumberland, for whom they had provided valuable intelligence of rebel activity.⁷⁰ The synod believed that their actions had sufficiently silenced their critics, one of whom recorded that "however foolish and enthusiastick their religious notions may be in other respects, they are firm Protestants and Revolutioners".⁷¹

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, 260.

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, 266.

⁷¹ *The history of the rebellion in the years 1745 and 1746*, 339; Adam Gib, *The Present Truth: A Display of the Secession Testimony; In the Three Periods of the Rise, State and Maintenance of that Testimony*, 2 vols. (Edinburgh, 1774), ii, 248; One nationalist, and in all likelihood republican, presbyterian sect condemned the houses of Stuart and Hanover in equal measure. Both Charles and Cumberland were described as pretenders. At one stage, after railing bitterly against the Prince in all the usual terms, including describing his father as a "limb of the anti-Christ", they criticised him for his lack of a killer instinct. "we reckon it a great vice in Charles, his foolish pity and lenity, in sparing these profane, blasphemous Red-coats, that Providence delivered into his hand [Prestonpans] when by putting them to death, this poor land might have been eased of the heavy burden of these Vermin of Hell". They went on to criticise Cumberland for his lack of mercy and for the cruelty, barbarity and inhumanity his troops displayed after Culloden; cruelties matched only by the Spanish inquisition. See *The Active Testimony of the True Presbyterians of Scotland, being a brief abstract of Acknowledgement of Sins, and Engagement to Duties* (1749), 26-9.

The Pulpit and the Prince

In truth, all presbyterians saw themselves as, “firm Protestants and Revolutioners,” and as such the very antithesis of the Stuarts whose Catholicism proved a perennial stumbling block to winning support. Despite promises that the position of the established church and clergy would be secured by suitable legislation and that they would continue in the full enjoyment of their religion, laws and liberties, the Prince failed to bridge the religious divide.⁷² It did not help that he relied heavily on France, Spain and the Papacy, a collective that Britons regarded as an unholy trinity forever associated with arbitrary power, slavery and tyranny.⁷³ Thus the Prince complained in his manifesto about the assiduous pens of ill-designing men that attacked his family.

Do not the Pulpits and Congregations of the Clergy, as well as your Weekly Papers, ring with the Dreadful threats of Popery, Slavery, Tyranny and Arbitrary Power, which are now ready to be imposed upon you, by the formidable powers of *France* and *Spain*? Is not my Royal father represented as a Bloodthirsty Tyrant, breathing out nothing but destruction, to all those who will not immediately embrace an odious religion?⁷⁴

Foremost among those ill-designing men were the ministers and elders of the synod of Glasgow and Ayr who issued a strongly worded memorial on 1 October. Bearing in mind the Jacobite victory at Prestonpans, that the Prince controlled Edinburgh and much of the east coast, and that the rebels had already demanded money and goods from Glasgow for their enterprise, the memorial struck an extremely defiant note. Urging continued loyalty to King George and the Protestant succession, the synod warned against being imposed upon by any promises made to preserve their religion, liberty and property. People were reminded that the pretender was a professed and bigoted papist

⁷² Allardyce, *Historical Papers*, i, 182-4.

⁷³ *Ibid.*, 182-4.

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, 183.

supported by popish powers who were notorious enemies of the civil and religious liberties of mankind.⁷⁵

In Edinburgh, ministers ignored requests from the Prince to observe public worship as usual. Irritated by the snub the Prince maintained that any blame for their neglect of duty lay with the ministers themselves, "as we are resolved to inflict no penalty that may possibly look like persecution". According to the *Scots Magazine*, the boycott while not universal was generally observed. The few that continued preaching prayed for King George and warmly recommend loyalty.⁷⁶ On 26 September ministers resolved to forego public worship the following Sunday and with few exceptions it remained that way until the end of the occupation of Edinburgh.⁷⁷

In response, the *Caledonian Mercury*, an Edinburgh paper sympathetic to the Prince, expressed disapproval of their actions on the grounds that ministers had perfect freedom to function without threats of interference. It published a spurious address to ministers from

⁷⁵ *Memorial and Admonition of the Reverend synod of Glasgow and Air, Met at Glasgow, the First of October 1745* (London, 1745). The synod issued a similar admonition in 1715.

⁷⁶ *Scots Magazine*, September 1745, 441; McVicar was said to have prayed, "Bless the king; thou knows what King I mean; may the crown sit long easy on his head, and for this man that is come amongst us to seek an earthly crown, we beseech thee in mercy, to take him to thyself and give him a crown of glory". See *The Woodhouselee Manuscript*, 40.

⁷⁷ *Scots Magazine*, September 1745, 463; The Rev. John Matheson of the High Kirk was preaching at Currie and used "railing and abusive language against the Prince". News of this reached the Prince who took no action and it was said that "No sober people approve Matheson's conduct". Hugh Blair also preached at Currie but preached the gospel and in prayer prayed for the government, "and prayed little more than what we have by example of the angel Michael, the Lord rebuke the Sathan, or in such termes against our enemies". Rev. George Bannatyne, minister of Craigie in Ayrshire, was visiting friends in Edinburgh when he was seized by Andrew Lumsden and accused of being a spy. Bannatyne was at his father's house up two flights of stairs when Lumsden returned with a guard of Highlanders. Tying some sheets together, he used them to escape out the window. *The Woodhouselee Manuscript*, 62-7.

parishioners, urging them to return to their pulpits because a prolonged absence would result in the universal breach of the Sabbath, hardships for the town's poor who depended upon Sabbath collections, and people starved of public ordinances may choose to attend episcopal meeting houses instead.⁷⁸

Ministers remained unmoved and insisted that they could not exercise their office under the indulgence of a prince they regarded as an enemy to their religious liberties. To do so would be an acknowledgement of the pretender's claims and a renunciation of their allegiance to King George. Their refusal to officiate was a declaration against the usurped authority of the Prince. The Edinburgh congregation of the Associate Synod also refused to meet in its church and led by Adam Gib, worshipped in the open air at Dreghorn near Colinton three miles west of the city. Meeting outside the town was intended as a testimony of their resolve not to come to terms with an enemy that controlled the town. According to Gib, "In our public capacity, it is fit that we make a voluntary removal from the place where they are, as from the seat of robbers, showing ourselves resolved that their seat shall not be ours".⁷⁹ Undaunted by the presence of rebels during public worship, Gib continued to preach against the rebellion and pray openly for King George and the government.

Acts of defiance against Jacobite occupation took place elsewhere. In Dundee, Jacobites tried to intimidate ministers by attending church services with loaded pistols and, "threatening in private to let them fly at us if we prayed for King George". Not only was he prayed for, but "loyalty was warmly recommended".⁸⁰ Despite the occupation, the town's ministers intended to observe a national fast appointed by King George to be held on 18 December. The public services for that day

⁷⁸ *Scots Magazine*, September 1745, 463-4; *The History of the rebellion in the years 1745 and 1746*.

⁷⁹ M'Kerrow, *History of the Secession Church*, i, 261.

⁸⁰ Andrew Henderson, *The History of the Rebellion, MDCCXLV and MDCCXLVI* (London, 1753), 38; Annette M. Smith, "Dundee and the '45", in *The 45, To gather an Intage Whole*, ed. Lesley Scott-Moncrieff (Edinburgh, 1988), 103-4

were abandoned after a dispute between Jacobite officers and ministers, particularly John Willison, over the terms to be used when praying for the King.⁸¹ Consequently ministers left their churches and worshipped in private houses across the town.⁸² Indeed, the national fast called by George II was observed by presbyteries throughout Scotland.

In Aberdeen, under Jacobite control until February 1746, John Bisset considered it an honour to be blamed by the rebels for stirring up the people against them.⁸³ By early October there had been no services in Aberdeen but Bisset saw no reason for the omission, "unless it was the presence of the enemy, who gave us no trouble. All of us prayed express as before, and [against] the troubler of Israel; [and] ever since this work began, hath preached and prayed more express, if more could be, than before". The synod of Aberdeen recommended to all ministers to pray *nominatum* for King George, and addressed him with strong expressions of loyalty. The synod's act and recommendations were received, approved and observed throughout the presbyteries.⁸⁴

Not everyone escaped physical abuse from the rebels. In March 1746, Thomas McCulloch, minister at Bellie in Fochabers, had his house damaged and he was taken prisoner for some weeks for reading out Cumberland's proclamation in the presence of a large number of rebels in his church.⁸⁵ In the aftermath of the rebellion, rebels on the run engaged in banditry and targeted ministers in the presbyteries of Garioch and Alford. The ministers at Marnoch, Leslie, Keig and Bourtie were all attacked and their houses plundered. In October 1746 the

⁸¹ *Ibid.*, 103-4.

⁸² Quoted in D. Macfarlane, *The Revivals of the Eighteenth Century Particularly at Cambuslang with three sermons by the Rev. George Whitefield* (Edinburgh, 1844), 250-51.

⁸³ Bisset, *Diary*, 353.

⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, 349; Memoirs of the Rebellion in 1745 and 1746 so far as it concerned the counties of Aberdeen and Banff, 125-6; NAS, CH2/146/8/498-9, Presbytery of Ellon; CH2/158/6/378-9, Presbytery of Fordyce; CH2/166/5/370-74, Presbytery of Garioch.

⁸⁵ NAS, CH2/747/1, 318. Bellie Kirk Session Minutes and accounts, 1711-1750.

presbyteries complained to the commission and the commander-in-chief of forces in Scotland, William Anne Kepple, second Earl of Albemarle, that the outrages continued and in the absence of government action ministers would be obliged to abandon their manses.⁸⁶

The reaction of the Jacobites is understandable in the light of the sermons ministers were preaching. During the rebellion the pulpit came into its own as a vehicle for articulating anti-Jacobite and pro-Hanoverian sentiments. When the Prince left Edinburgh for England the Commission of the General Assembly quickly convened and encouraged ministers to continue, "to fill the minds of people of all ranks and ages ... with a just abhorrence of the abominations of Popery; the terrors of arbitrary power; and of the extreme danger these lands must be certainly exposed to of being over-run with superstition, tyranny and oppression, if God for our sins should ever suffer the pretender to reign over us".⁸⁷

The sermons were designed to highlight the dangers posed by the rebellion and to encourage people to remain constant under trial, to maintain a firm and unshaken faith in God and to be zealous for the defence of their nation, constitution, religion and liberties. Thus, when Lord Reay called out the men in the parish of Durness in the northern Highlands, as part of one of the independent companies raised by Duncan Forbes at Inverness, the local minister Murdoch Macdonald, accompanied them to the boundary of the parish where he preached a sermon of encouragement. Similar encouragement was directed at the Earl of Sutherland by the Presbytery of Dornoch. The presbytery praised Sutherland's steady and constant adherence to the Protestant and revolution interest, which he had demonstrated by his readiness to raise independent companies in the service of the government. In a sermon to the volunteers from the parish of Inveresk, William Halyburton, who was also a volunteer, discoursed upon love to their country, in particular what it consisted of and how it was to be

⁸⁶ NAS, CH1/3/24, 451.

⁸⁷ *Scots Magazine*, November 1745, 517-21.

expressed during the present crisis. According to Halyburton's criteria, the rebels clearly had no love for their country otherwise they would not seek to overthrow a constitution that was "as near to perfection, as any that ever yet took place". The volunteer's love for their country was manifested in "vigorously asserting and defending the liberties of our country, when they are invaded and in danger of being lost".⁸⁸ John Willison's sermons aimed to "un-deceive" the simple, "into whom Jacobite Protestants would fain instil more favourable notions of popery than what is just, in order to pave the way for setting up a Popish King over them".⁸⁹

Ministers therefore attacked the rebellion as unreasonable and unnatural because they insisted it intended to replace what they regarded as the finest of constitutions with the worst form of government. Edinburgh minister Andrew Richardson reminded his people that they lived in days of liberty and knew nothing of the tyranny their fathers had suffered before the revolution. Liberty was the glory of Britain. No nation enjoyed it so fully.⁹⁰ Extolling the benefits of the revolution, union and Protestant succession Patrick Cumming declared,

O Happy island! If thou knewest thy own happiness, the seat of liberty and learning, the refuge of the oppressed and persecuted, the Terror of Tyrants, the Bulwark of true religion, the Empress of the sea, supreme in trade and commerce, safe in thy laws, safe in thy

⁸⁸ Hew Morrison, "Notices of the Ministers of the presbytery of Tongue from 1726 to 1763: From the Diary of the Rev. Murdoch Macdonald of Durness". *Transactions of the Gaelic Society of Inverness*, xi (Inverness, 1884-85), 298; *The Caledonian Mercury* 30 November 1745; William Halyburton, *Love to our Country: A Sermon on Romans IX, 3. Preached in the church of Inveresk, Jamary 5, 1746 and published at the request of the Volhmteers of that Parish* (Edinburgh, 1746), 6 & 14.

⁸⁹ Willison, *Popery another Gospel*, p.iv.

⁹⁰ Richardson, *A free and arbitrary government compared in two sermons*, 19.

Sovereign, and safe in the prospect of a numerous Royal race, who may transmit these inestimable Blessings to posterity.⁹¹

Jacobites were accused of treachery for having attempted to redress their grievances by force rather than through constitutional means.⁹² Indeed, the Prince's constitutional credentials were damaged by his failure to fulfil his promise to reconvene the Scottish Parliament. The commission was dismissive and insisted that he who bases his right to govern on hereditary and indefeasible right would not be restrained by any limitation or have regard in government to anything other than his own will. Scotland could not expect a free parliament from an armed force.⁹³

As for that armed force, ministers claimed that the Prince's predominately Highland army was made up of those into whose savage breasts the spirit of British liberty had not yet entered. Articulating lowland stereotypes, the Highlands were said to be inhabited by a people inured to slavery and to absolute subjection to their chiefs and who were prepared to do or suffer anything for their idol king.⁹⁴ The

⁹¹ Patrick Cumming, *A Sermon preached in the Old Church of Edinburgh, December 18th, 1745, being the Fast Day appointed by the King for the rebellion* (Edinburgh, 1746), 27.

⁹² *A loyal Address to the Citizens of Glasgow, Occasioned by the Present Rebellion* (1745), 18-19.

⁹³ "A Seasonable warning and exhortation of the Commission of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, met at Edinburgh 15 November 1745", in *The Scots Magazine*, 1745, 517-9; Sermons of the time typically contrasted the benefits, civil and religious liberties and free government enjoyed under Hanover with the arbitrary and tyrannical government they would endure under the Stuarts. Andrew, Richardson, *A free and arbitrary government compared in two sermons. The first preached in the church of Broughton, on Wednesday the 18th of December 1745: being the day appointed by the King for a general fast on account of the present rebellion and the second preached in the same place* (Edinburgh, 1746); John Willison, *Popery another Gospel*; Patrick Cumming, *A Sermon...December 18th, 1745*, 28-9.

⁹⁴ Richardson, *A free and arbitrary government compared in two sermons*, 22.

goal of the church following the Revolution had been to bring the Highlands within the fold of the established church and a “barbarous people” into the king’s obedience.⁹⁵ The Kirk saw itself as a civilising influence and the surest way of bringing the Highlands into mainstream Scottish life, as well as counteract the influence of Jacobitism, was to convert the Highlands to reformed presbyterianism. Presbyterian progress in the Highlands was slow and unspectacular.⁹⁶

The work of the church was assisted through the Royal Bounty, which was an annual sum of money provided by the crown for the promotion of presbyterianism in the Highlands. Established in 1725, the bounty was used to employ itinerant catechists, probationers and missionary ministers.⁹⁷ From its inception, the Royal Bounty committee worked closely with the Society in Scotland for Propagating Christian Knowledge, a religious society founded by royal charter in Edinburgh in 1709 whose aim was the promotion of Protestantism in the Highlands through the planting of schools and provision of education.

In a sermon delivered before the society in January 1746, Robert Wallace claimed the rebellion had taught them the necessity of enlightening the Highlands and islands, one of the dark places of the earth, with the knowledge of true religion. According to Wallace, the

⁹⁵ *Acts of the General Assembly*, 231.

⁹⁶ For details of the church’s progress in the Highlands, see, John Macinnes, *The Evangelical Movement in the Highlands of Scotland 1688 to 1800* (Aberdeen, 1951); Fiona A. Macdonald, *Missions to the Gaels, Reformation and Counter-Reformation in Ulster and the Highlands and Islands of Scotland 1560-1760* (Edinburgh, 2006); William Ferguson, “The Problems of the established Church in the West Highlands in the Eighteenth Century”, *Records of the Scottish Church History Society*, 17 (1969). While the rebellion gave the mission added impetus, it would be wrong to suggest as Robert Clyde has done, that there was no real interest shown in the subject of religion in the Highlands until after Culloden. Robert Clyde, *From Rebel to Hero, the image of the Highlander, 1745-1830* (East Linton, 1995), 49.

⁹⁷ Domhnall Uilleam Stiùbhart, “The genesis and operation of the Royal Bounty scheme 1725-30”, *Records of the Scottish Church History Society*, 33 (Edinburgh, 2003), 63-141.

clans, without whom there would have been no rebellion, would never have engaged in it had it not been for the fact they were ignorant, superstitious and uncivilized. Without the work of the society things might have been worse and Wallace urged them to embrace every opportunity to enlighten the darkness.⁹⁸ Wallace was one voice among many galvanised by the rebellion into calling for renewed efforts to promote presbyterianism in the Highlands as a means of rooting out prelacy and popery and thus disaffection.⁹⁹

Not surprisingly, Jacobite ideology was the focus of particular attention. Ministers maintained that divine right and indefeasible hereditary succession was inconsistent with reason, the light of nature and the Word of God and was therefore, "absurd and unreasonable". It made God the "patron of a perpetual and unalterable tyranny". What they were defending were the natural rights of mankind asserted by their happy revolution, the right to defend themselves and their property against tyranny and oppression. The rights of sovereignty and succession were established in such a way as to also establish the rights of the people to be protected in all their interests.¹⁰⁰ Indeed, John Willison insisted that the Stuarts themselves came to the throne by choice and with the consent of parliament and people; the hereditary right had belonged to Balliol and not Bruce from whom the Stuarts were descended. The nation had judged Balliol to have forfeited the crown by his unworthy behaviour and that Bruce was more deserving. Hereditary right was therefore alterable not indefeasible.¹⁰¹

⁹⁸ Robert Wallace, *Ignorance and Superstition a source of Violence and Cruelty, and in particular the Cause of the present Rebellion. A Sermon preached in the High Church of Edinburgh, Monday January 6. 1745-6. Upon occasion of the Anniversary Meeting of the Society in Scotland for Propagating Christian Knowledge* (Edinburgh, 1746), 5, 35-9.

⁹⁹ Clyde, *From Rebel to Hero*, 49-96.

¹⁰⁰ Wishart, *Being the substance of some Sermons*, 19-23. Richardson, *A free and arbitrary government compared in two sermons*, 11-19.

¹⁰¹ Willison, *Popery another Gospel*, viii.

Jacobite ideology was attacked as being inconsistent with free government. Andrew Richardson insisted that free government was founded upon a mutual contract between rulers and the people. Tyrants like the Stuarts encroached upon the liberties of the people under the pretence of acting for the common good. Once in a position of power they disowned their obligation to the people and claimed their power was independent of the people and derived directly from God, to whom alone they were accountable. Their supporters argued that this right was hereditary and could not be forfeited by any cruelties or injustice that they or their posterity might commit.

This ideology destroyed the mutual obligations existing between rulers and their people and gave birth to arbitrary government.¹⁰² One Jacobite writer did nothing to dispel these convictions by stating that James was fully convinced that being supreme on earth he was unaccountable to the people for any failures of his government and that the only restraint upon him was the prospect of future judgment. Talk of unaccountable kings was not the way to win over the advocates of limited monarchy. Nor indeed was it wise to attack the source of that limitation, the people.

The idea that rulers governed by the consent of the people, was contemptuously dismissed,

The truth is the majority of all nations are always so weak and ignorant that they cant possibly determine in any matter of importance and far less judge of the qualifications of a King, and therefore we may safely infer that God never designed them to be the fountain of power and government. For to make the people's choice and election the foundation of and only right to government and yet by his providence to order that they shall be incapable of chusing well, would be, I imagine and absurdity and a reflection on the D Wisdom.¹⁰³

¹⁰² Richardson, *A free and arbitrary government compared in two sermons*, 7-13.

¹⁰³ NAS, CH12/16/53. Speech addressed to the Commission of the General Assembly.

Uniform support for the government among ministers proved of invaluable service in terms of gathering intelligence. In early August when government circles in Edinburgh were in the grip of confusion and uncertainty, Lauchlan Campbell, minister of Ardnamurchan and Eilean Finain, provided the first piece of concrete news that the Prince had landed. Aware that the Jacobites were "in high spirits", Campbell managed to extract from one of his parishioners information that the Prince was in Kinlochmoidart.¹⁰⁴ Later that month Peter King catechist from Lochaber, provided information about the size and strength of the Prince's army, information that the government must have found a little disconcerting.¹⁰⁵

The intelligence submitted was useful if not always encouraging. On 1 January 1746 Lachlan Shaw, minister at Elgin, provided John Campbell, fourth earl of Loudon, with intelligence about Jacobite movements around Aberdeen and news of the defeat of Loudon's men at Inverurie the previous week. Shaw had gleaned his information from the postman who had arrived from Aberdeen with a few letters, none of which were for Shaw and all of which had already been opened. Shaw explained that he "used the freedom to peruse them", and what was useful he forwarded to Loudon after confirming the accuracy of the information with the postman.¹⁰⁶

Gathering intelligence was a risky business. Rebels seized the minister of Kintore while he was out in search of "more certain intelligence," prior to the skirmish at Inverurie in December 1745.¹⁰⁷ Marching through Perthshire, Joseph Yorke, Cumberland's aide-de-

¹⁰⁴ Sir James Fergusson, *Argyll in the Forty-Five* (London, 1951), 15; W.B. Blaikie, "The First News that Reached Edinburgh of the Landing of Prince Charles, 1745", in *The Scottish Historical Review*, xxiii (1926), 161-170.

¹⁰⁵ PRO, SP54/25/104B, Declaration of Information by Peter King, Catechist, August 1745.

¹⁰⁶ Loudon Papers, LO12613, box 43. Rev. Lachlan Shaw to Lord Loudon, 1 January 1746.

¹⁰⁷ "Memoirs of the Rebellion in 1745 and 1746, so far as it Concerned the Counties of Aberdeen and Banff", 141.

camp wrote, "The presbyterian ministers are the only people we can trust".¹⁰⁸ Among them was Robert Robertson of Kirkmichael near Blair Atholl. Robertson had sent an agent north to gather intelligence about rebel movements and their troop numbers and submitted a lengthy report to James Duke of Atholl, elder brother of Lord George Murray.¹⁰⁹

During the campaign independent companies and volunteer militias supplemented regular government forces. This was particularly important in areas and at times when the government had no military presence. Ministers played a significant role in recruiting and in participating in military activity. Divinity students like Alexander Carlyle and John Home and the recently ordained William Robertson were among those who rallied to the defence of Edinburgh and joined

¹⁰⁸ *The History of the rebellion in the years 1745 and 1746*, 339; Yorke, *Life and Correspondence of Philip Yorke*, 500.

¹⁰⁹ *The Chronicles of Atholl and Tullibardine Families*, 5 vols. (Edinburgh, 1908), ii, 227-29. Robertson also suggested sending someone else on another mission. The person in question had been a secretary to Lord George but had absconded and stayed in Perthshire when the army marched north. Robertson suggested sending him north to resume his former post and from there, either sending intelligence to Cumberland or desert and cross over to Cumberland prior to the two armies meeting in battle. Robertson insisted that should such a mission be undertaken, the government should provide for the individual concerned after the campaign. Robertson was aware that he was effectively asking the Duke to spy on his own brother and for that reason would only undertake it with the Duke's permission. Patrick Grant, minister at Calder, provided intelligence to Ludovick Grant about the activities of members of Clan Chattan in and around his parish in October 1745. See *The Chronicles of Atholl*, iii, 172-3; Ministers along the east coast of Scotland provided Cumberland with intelligence during his march north and stay in Aberdeen. Sec, Cumberland Papers, CP10/220, "Anent the march of the Highland army through Kirrimuir, Glamis, Brechin and Montrose on the 4th, 5th, 6th and 7th of February 1746. By a presb Minister in Angus"; CP12/49, Rev. George Aitken to Managers at Montrose, 11 March 1746; CP12/91, Rev. Alexander Gordon to Everard Fawkener, 13 March 1746; CP12/194, Intelligence of Rev. Stewart, 19 March 1746; CP12/279, Intelligence of Rev. John Macinnes, 22 March 1746; CP12/328, Rev. James Lumsden to Rev. James Pollock, Fyvie, 25 March 1746.

the town's militia in September 1745. Robertson also offered his services to Sir John Cope but was refused. However, city ministers like William Wishart were unwilling to expose the "flower of the youth of Edinburgh, and the hope of the next generation, to the danger of being cut off, or made prisoners and maltreated, without any just or adequate object". He successfully persuaded them to stand down on the grounds that their numbers were insignificant and added little to the strength of the militia and that their withdrawal would make little difference.¹¹⁰

During the Jacobite invasion of England, Edinburgh was quickly re-occupied and measures taken to protect it against any subsequent Jacobite attack. Andrew Fletcher, Lord Milton the Lord Justice Clerk wanted to augment the government forces under General Handasyde with local militias. On 20 November, a new subscription was opened for raising a one thousand strong militia from the city. The volunteers who had made up the city militia in September were invited to rejoin and ministers assisted in a successful recruitment drive.¹¹¹ A week later ministers helped compile parochial lists of men for the militia. The Associate Synod, which had raised around two hundred men in September for the defence of Edinburgh, raised around three hundred men and another four hundred men were raised in Stirling.¹¹² The synod hired a sergeant to teach them military exercises and carried colours emblazoned with the inscription, "For religion, the covenants, king and kingdoms".¹¹³

On 15 November Andrew Cochrane Provost of Glasgow, announced the city's intention to raise a militia. Fletcher provided the arms and the earl of Home was appointed their commander. Six hundred men were raised in nine days and they marched out of the city on 10 December to reinforce the regular troops and guard the passes south. Another six hundred men were raised for the defence of the town. Following the

¹¹⁰ *The Autobiography of Dr Alexander Carlyle of Inveresk 1722-1805*, ed. John Hill Burton (Edinburgh, 1910), 128-9.

¹¹¹ *Scots Magazine*, November 1745, 539.

¹¹² *Ibid.*, 539.

¹¹³ M'Kerrow, *History of the Secession Church*, i, 260.

return to Scotland of the Jacobite army, the Glasgow militia was ordered to Edinburgh, leaving Glasgow undefended.¹¹⁴ Ministers not only helped recruit the Glasgow militia, some joined it. On 7 January 1746 the Presbytery of Irvine passed a resolution encouraging parishes to send out parties of volunteers to support the government. In the Barony of Broadstone the parish minister, John Witherspoon, drew up a subscription paper signed by the feuars and tenants. The Beith militia as it became known marched to Glasgow with Witherspoon at its head. They were ordered to return home but under Witherspoon's command joined the militia at Falkirk where he was taken prisoner. Witherspoon and another minister called Andrew M'vey, later of Dreghorn in the presbytery of Irvine, were kept at Doune Castle from where M'Vey escaped dressed as a woman carrying a tea-kettle.¹¹⁵

In all the Glasgow regiment lost twenty-two killed at Falkirk as well as eleven wounded and fourteen taken prisoner.¹¹⁶ Such was the reputation of ministers that rumours quickly spread that 8 had been killed at Falkirk and that there had been ministers killed and wounded at Inverurie.¹¹⁷ The Glasgow congregations of the Associate Synod also formed a militia some of whom were killed at Falkirk, where they were said to have behaved with, "interpidity and firmness".¹¹⁸ In view of the humiliating and hasty retreat performed by the regular forces at Falkirk, it was considerable praise. Another of the ministers captured at Falkirk and who later escaped was Patrick Simson, minister at Fala near Dalkeith. Simson had been present at Prestonpans and it appears from the following that he had quickly taken flight with the rest of Cope's army.

¹¹⁴ NLS MS 3736, fo.991v. According to Cochrane, the officers paid for themselves and the town raised money to pay for the men at 12d per day for a sergeant, 10d per day for a corporal and drummer and 8d per day for a private.

¹¹⁵ *The Cochrane correspondence regarding the affairs of Glasgow, MDCCXLV-VI*, ed. James Dennistoun (Glasgow, 1836), 119; Witherspoon was a signatory to the American declaration of independence; *FES*, iii, 88.

¹¹⁶ *The Cochrane correspondence*, 118.

¹¹⁷ Bisset, *Diary*, 371.

¹¹⁸ M'Kerrow, *History of the Secession Church*, i, 262-3.

And Simson keen, to clear the een
 Of rebels far in wrang, man,
 Did never strive, wi pistols live,
 But gallop'd wi the thrang, man;
 He turned his back, and in a crack
 Was cleanly out of sight, man,
 And thought it best: it was nae jest
 Wi Highlanders to fight, man.¹¹⁹

After his escape Simson joined an independent company called the "Yorkshire Blues" and held the office of Ensign. The company had been raised by William Thornton of Thornville near Knaresborough and were attached to Pulteney's 13th regiment of foot.¹²⁰ Simson marched north with the regiment to Aberdeen and it is more than likely he was present at Culloden. In the north eastern Highlands ministers who had been active in raising men for Loudon's independent companies and in thwarting Jacobite recruitment were forced to retreat into Sutherland for fear of reprisals from the rebels.¹²¹ In Perthshire, Alexander Stewart, minister at Blair Atholl, was captured along with men of the Argyll militia during Lord George Murray's raid on Atholl in March 1746.¹²² In Aberdeen divinity students were among volunteers attempting to defeat the rebels at Inverurie and Ministers were not shy of taking on rebels when the occasion arose. Patrick Reid, minister of Clatt, and some of his parishioners disarmed and captured two rebels and at New Deer, William Taylor disarmed two Hussars and sent them packing, having knocked one of them off his horse. Reid also provided

¹¹⁹ *FES*, i, 319.

¹²⁰ "Memoirs of the Rebellion in 1745 and 1746 so far as it Concerned the Counties of Aberdeen and Banff", 158.

¹²¹ Daniel Munro, "An Account of the Late Rebellion from Ross and Sutherland", in *Origins of the Forty-Five, and other papers relating to that rising*, ed. Walter B. Blaikie (Edinburgh, 1916), 110.

¹²² *The Chronicles of Atholl*, ii, 234.

information to government forces in pursuit of rebel forces under the command of Colonel John Roy Stewart.¹²³

In the north in particular where the Jacobites had high expectations of strong support, ministers were instrumental in hindering recruitment. One observer noted that the efforts of George Forbes of Skellater to raise men for the Prince were thwarted by James Lumsden, minister at Towey.¹²⁴ Forbes was Lumsden's uncle and according to John Bisset, Lumsden was seeking to thwart Forbes again in March 1746 by informing the authorities that he was operating in Strathdon.¹²⁵ Bisset claimed that the blame for the poor response to Lord Lewis Gordon's recruitment drive was placed at the door of the presbyterian ministers who had been preaching against the rebellion and encouraging their congregations to remain loyal.¹²⁶ As one contemporary remarked, the rebels were "excessively baulked" when they saw ministers "at such extraordinary pains to raise worthy sentiments in the people, and sparing neither purse nor persons in the service of the government as far as they had opportunity".¹²⁷

¹²³ "Memoirs of the Rebellion in 1745 and 1746 so far as it Concerned the Counties of Aberdeen and Banff", 150-51; Sir William Fraser, *The Chiefs of Grant*, 3 vols. (Edinburgh, 1876), ii, 251. Ludovick Grant to his father James Grant, 19 March 1746.

¹²⁴ "Memoirs of the Rebellion in 1745 and 1746 so far as it Concerned the Counties of Aberdeen and Banff", 114.

¹²⁵ *FES*, vi, 142; Bisset, *Diary*, 391.

¹²⁶ Bisset, *Diary*, 355.

¹²⁷ "Memoirs of the Rebellion in 1745 and 1746 so far as it Concerned the Counties of Aberdeen and Banff", 125. In a letter to the laird of Stonywood on 29 October 1745, Lord Lewis Gordon complained that the Prince's "affairs have suffered by the vile and malicious behaviour of the Presbyterian ministers, who abuse his Highnesses goodness by irritating the minds of the common people, in telling them a parcel of infamous lies. I therefore require and direct you to issue out an order in my name to all the ministers in your part of the country, intimating that if they dare to say a disrespectful word of the prince, or any of his friends, that I will punish them as the law directs". Letters from Lord Lewis Gordon and others to the

Cumberland's victory at Culloden was greeted with what the *Scots Magazine* described as, "very extraordinary public rejoicings".¹²⁸ The *Glasgow Journal* also reported that the news was welcomed with the "greatest rejoicings". In the afternoon the magistrates, provost, ministers and local dignitaries drank numerous toasts at the cross where, "All ranks and degrees of people on this occasion exprest the highest joy".¹²⁹ Loyal addresses from across Britain quickly followed, including those from Aberdeen, Glasgow, Stirling and Edinburgh. Thanksgiving sermons were preached and published in places as far away as Boston.¹³⁰ On 19 May the General Assembly, sent congratulatory letters to King George and Cumberland and appointed a day of thanksgiving to

Laird of Stonywood, in *The Miscellany of the Spalding Club*, I, John Stuart ed., (Aberdeen, 1841), 403.

¹²⁸ *The Scots Magazine*, April 1746. Andrew Henderson wrote that the 16th of April was the "beginning of a Jubilee ... The Joy upon publishing the news was as universal as the illuminations the most splendid ever seen, were general and delightful, forming but one continued Blaze! From London to the utmost Bounds of the British dominions in America". See Henderson, *The History of the Rebellion*, 342-3.

¹²⁹ *The Glasgow Journal*, Number 248, Monday April 21st to Monday April 28th, 1746; *The Glasgow Courant*, Numbers 29 and 30, Monday April 28th to Monday May 5th, 1746.

¹³⁰ The Angus Archives, MS 120, Papers of Rev. George Ogilvy includes a sermon of thanksgiving for Culloden; John Barker, *A sermon occasion'd by the victory over the rebels in Scotland on the 16th April 1746 by His Majesty's army under the command of His Royal Highness the Duke of Cumberland* (London, 1746); John Burton, *The exhortation and advice of Sammel to the men of Israel applied: a sermon preached before the university of Oxford, at St Mary's, October 9, 1746, being the day appointed to be kept as a general thanksgiving to Almighty God for the suppression of the late rebellion* (Oxford, 1746); T. Prince, *Sermon delivered in Boston New England, 14 August 1746, being the day of thanksgiving for the deliverance of the British nation by the happy victory near Culloden, obtained by H. R. H., Duke of Cumberland, April 16 last* (Boston, 1746); Webster, *Heathens professing Judaism*.

be held in all parishes in June.¹³¹ Across Scotland Kirk Sessions, Presbyteries and synods recorded with satisfaction the victory of Cumberland and appointed days of fasting and thanksgiving and the 26 June was held as a National day of Thanksgiving. The Highland synod of Glenelg was typical in its praises and added in relation to its particular circumstances,

Too many indeed of those among whom we live, it is with a real grief of heart we own it, have been wicked enough to have engaged in the late insurrection but these infatuated men have ever been avowed enemies to the Church of Scotland and under the influence of Popish emissaries and non-juring clergymen; but it will be allowed that the most considerable persons in our bounds have distinguished themselves by a steady affection for their king and the interest of their country; and if the success of our exhortations had been equal to our zeal, the adherents of a Popish pretender in this quarter had all been peaceable and dutiful subjects.¹³²

Despite strong opposition to the rebellion the church was not without compassion towards those who had taken up arms for the Stuarts. Patrick Cumming called upon his people to, "pity and pray for those deluded and desperate men ... Whilst our souls are filled with indignation at this wicked attempt, whilst we rejoice in the hopes of their being defeated; we cannot forbear to lament their deplorable fate".¹³³ Ministers were also closely involved in helping rebels to

¹³¹ *Acts of the General Assembly*, 685-89.

¹³² Rev. Thomas M., Murchison. "The synod of Glenelg, 1725-1821", *Transactions of the Gaelic Society of Inverness*, XXXVII, 1937-41 (Inverness, 1962), 102. See also other northern kirk sessions such as those of Cullen, Deskford, Fordyce and Aberdeen in Alistair Tayler and Henrietta Tayler, *Jacobites of Aberdeenshire and Banffshire in the Forty-Five* (Aberdeen, 1928), 104-105; The Presbytery of Tongue in, Angus Mackay, *The Book of Mackay* (Edinburgh, 1906), 453-6.

¹³³ Cumming, *A Sermon preached in the Old Church*, 32-3.

surrender. On 24 February, a proclamation ordered rebels to surrender themselves and their arms to magistrates or ministers of the Kirk and thus submit themselves to the king's mercy. Those who complied would be allowed to return home until required. This was still the official policy after Culloden.¹³⁴ Men like Major General John Campbell and Lord Loudon, implemented the policy strictly and humanely.¹³⁵ However, other officers were not so inclined.

Operating from his ship the *Furnace*, Captain John Ferguson, pursued a ruthless policy of burning, plunder and destruction along the coast of the western Highlands and Isles. Similarly, Captain Caroline Scott, Lieutenant Colonel Edward Cornwallis, Major Alexander Lockhart and George Munro of Culcairn, whose cruelties provoked his own murder, set about their appointed tasks with ruthless and cruel efficiency.¹³⁶ From Fort Augustus, Thomas Ashe Lee described their work in the Highlands as, "converting them to Christianity and propagating a new light among them". Of the rebels, he said, "Some few of them bring in their arms, others skulk in the woods and mountains, but we take care to leave them no sustenance, unless they can browse like their goats". Referring to an expedition of Major William Lockhart at Glenmoriston where he had killed seventeen rebels, Lee wrote that they had left some, "hanging by the heels in

¹³⁴ *The Whitefoord Papers being the Correspondence and other Manuscripts of Colonel Charles Whitefoord and Caleb Whitefoord from 1739 to 1810*, ed. W.A.S. Hewins (Oxford, 1898), 76-80.

¹³⁵ Campbell gave orders "to receive such arms as were brought in, taking down the names and places of abode of such as surrendered, that the common people should be allowed to return home. But if any gentlemen come in they shall be civilly treated but kept prisoners till such time as I should know H.R.Hs. pleasure concerning them". Quoted in W. A. Speck, *The Butcher. The Duke of Cumberland and the Suppression of the 45* (Oxford, 1981), 165.

¹³⁶ For a more detailed treatment of the aftermath of the '45 in the Highlands, see Allan I. Macinnes, "The Aftermath of the 45", in *1745 Charles Edward Stuart and the Jacobites*, ed. Robert C. Woosnam-Savage (Edinburgh, 1995).

different parts, with labels expressing the reason of it, burnt about 400 houses and drove home about 1400 head of cattle".¹³⁷

In the light of these atrocities it was not surprising that rebels preferred surrendering to ministers who went to considerable lengths to help them. The *Scots Magazine* reported that several people in the parish of Kingussie in Badenoch, who had been seduced and compelled by the rebels to join them, travelled to Blair Atholl with their minister Mr William Blair, John Macpherson of Benchar and Donald Macpherson of Cullinlin. They delivered up their arms to Brigadier Mordaunt, submitted themselves to the king's mercy and were permitted to return home peaceably.¹³⁸ Blair also wrote to Loudon on 30 April 1746 asking for help for a woman whose husband was a Jacobite.¹³⁹

Responding to Cumberland's proclamation, John Doeg of Carseburn had gone to the Rev. John Ker seeking a certificate. Ker refused a certificate because he was under the impression that after the

¹³⁷ *Letters to Henry Fox*, ed. Earl of Ilchester (London, 1915), 14. Lord George Sackville had taken men on an expedition into Glenshiel and Moidart, "Glengarry's house and country is this moment blazing, for he broke his word in not bringing in the remainder of his men within a limited time".

¹³⁸ Quoted in, Alexander Macpherson, "Sketches of the Old Ministers of Badenoch", *Transactions of the Gaelic Society of Inverness*, XIV, 1887-88 (Inverness, 1889), 202-3.

¹³⁹ Loudon Papers, LO,10850; NAS. CH2/271/6/333; Synod of Moray, 17 April 1746, The ministers within these bounds to be very cautious in attesting any of those who have been either actually and openly in rebellion or who may be taken up upon suspicion. That no minister shall adventure to grant attestation to any but to those of their own parishes respectively. And that ministers, before granting such attestation shall if attainable, advise with some neighbouring ministers and with their own presbytery where the case can admit of delay. Ministers were to keep exact copies of such attestations as they grant to be produced when called for: CH2/158/6/380, Presbytery of Fordyce, 30 April 1746, resolution anent certificates for surrendering rebels. No certificate was to be given to anyone from out-with the bounds of the presbytery.

battle of Culloden, his power to do so had ended.¹⁴⁰ Consequently, Doeg was arrested and taken to Inverness to be shipped to London for trial. His wife Cristian travelled to Inverness and represented his case to the commanding officer who assured her that if the minister of the parish gave her a letter signifying that her husband had offered to surrender himself and that he had not been in the north with the rebels, and she delivered the letter to the magistrate or commanding officer where her husband was held, he would be set free. Realising that his mistake had led to "this poor man's" incarceration, Ker duly obliged with a letter indicating that Doeg had attempted to surrender himself.¹⁴¹ That should have brought the affair to a close but while Cristian went home to get the certificate, her husband was shipped out of Inverness on the *Jane of Leith* and taken to Tilbury Fort in London. Armed with Ker's letter and a number of other testimonials, she travelled to London and eventually secured her husband's release.¹⁴²

A second proclamation issued on 1 May also required ministers to supply information on the behaviour of parishioners and on the whereabouts of any in hiding. Severe penalties were threatened for helping or hiding rebels.¹⁴³ Ministers were reluctant to comply with its stringent terms. In June 1746, Alexander Lind, sheriff depute of Midlothian ordered ministers of the shire to compile a list of all those in their parishes who had not been involved in the rebellion. The aim, it was argued, was to avoid unjust suspicions. The ministers refused on the grounds that the annual lists of parishioners had been lost during the troubles. During the rebel occupation of the city and surrounding region, many ministers remained at home and were not in a position to know who had joined the rebels. Any lists they drew up were likely to be imperfect and could result in people being wrongly accused. They

¹⁴⁰ PRO, TS20/130/7, Testimony of Rev John Ker.

¹⁴¹ *Ibid.*

¹⁴² PRO, TS20/130/7. Testimony of Cristian Hakeney; TS20/130/7, Testimony of Lord Gray; PRO, TS20/131/19; *The Prisoners of the '45*, edd. Sir Bruce G. Seton & Jean G. Arnot, 2 vols. (Edinburgh, 1929), ii, 156.

¹⁴³ PRO, SP 54/31/31B.

urged the sheriff depute to use other more reliable methods for discovering those involved in rebellion. Sir Everard Fawkener, Cumberland's secretary, responded to the ministers by stating that the injunction was not meant to cause them trouble. He added that motives of pity were apt to seduce and that the law was not about revenge but justice. God had put the sword in the hands of the magistrate to dispense justice and to protect the good by punishing the wicked; it was almost always the case that ill-judged lenity was the greatest cruelty.¹⁴⁴

Conclusion

Jacobitism and presbyterianism were incompatible politically, ideologically, theologically and ecclesiastically. Stuart hopes of an accommodation and of securing presbyterian support, particularly through the promotion of anti-unionism, were without foundation. The persistent rumours of presbyterian support for the Stuarts, particularly in the west of Scotland, had more to do with inter-denominational presbyterian politics than the actual existence of any such support.

The evidence overwhelmingly suggests that despite presbyterian hostility to the union, their hostility to the Stuarts was greater still. Nothing could induce them to rally to the Stuart cause, not even the prospect of the restoration of Scotland's independence, parliament and sovereignty. Quite the contrary, whenever the Jacobites appeared to threaten the present establishment and revolution interest, presbyterians were vocal in their denunciations of the pretender and in their expressions of support for and loyalty towards the Protestant succession. Allan Macinnes has argued that anti-Jacobitism did not necessarily translate into enthusiasm for Hanover.¹⁴⁵ However, in the case of the church the evidence suggests that it did. Before, during and after the Hanoverian succession the church collective enthusiastically sang hymns to Hanover. Acts, declarations and addresses, sermons, even poetry, were no mere form of words but genuine expressions of

¹⁴⁴ *The Scots Magazine*, May 1746, 272-4.

¹⁴⁵ Macinnes, "Jacobitism in Scotland", 243.

support for the “illustrious” house to which the church had nailed its colours.¹⁴⁶

The Stuarts were forever associated in the presbyterian mind with tyranny, popery and arbitrary power, the very antithesis of the civil and religious liberties and numerous constitutional blessings they had enjoyed since and associated with the Revolution and latterly the union. As beneficiaries of the Revolution, presbyterians were determined to

¹⁴⁶ For further evidence, see John Anderson, *A Sermon, preach'd in the Tron Church of Glasgow, on Thirsday the 28th of May, MDCCXIX, being the Anniversary of the Birth of his Majesty King George* (Glasgow, 1719); *Good News from the North, or the Best way to have our Gracious Sovereign King George long continued as a great mercy to these nations. Contained in a Sermon preached at Inverness, October 20th 1714, being his majesties Coronation Day, on Psalm 21. 7, By one of the Established Chmrrch there* (Edinburgh, 1715). NAS, CH1/3/11, 326-7, Commission of General Assembly, 7 March 1712; CH1/3/13, 68-9 Commission of General Assembly, 10 March 1713 (act anent the protestant succession; CH1/3/13, 247-9 Commission of General Assembly, address to King George, 12 August 1714; CH1/3/13, 274-5 Commission of General Assembly, day of thanksgiving for the accession of King George; CH2/12/3, 74-6, synod of Angus and Mearns, act for a fast containing anti-Jacobite and pro-Hanoverian sentiments, 2 July 1712; CH2/12/4, 33-5 synod of Angus and Mearns, address to King George, 19 April 1716; CH2/154/6, 174, synod of Fife, address to Anne regarding the Abjuration Oath, 18 June 1712; CH2/154/6, 271, synod of Fife address to King George, 30 September 1714; CH2/271/5, 11-13 synod of Moray, address to King George containing anti-Jacobite and pro-Hanoverian sentiments, 7 October 1714; CH2/271/5, 31-2, Address to King George; CH2/271/6, 323-5, synod of Moray address to King George; CH2/393/2, 500-1, presbytery of Hamilton, Act for a fast containing strong anti-Jacobite and pro-Hanoverian sentiments, 17 January 1716; CH2/449/10, 126-9, synod of Perth and Stirling, 9 April 1746; CH2/840/2, 283-5, synod of Aberdcen, rules concerning the abjuration oath and expressions of loyalty to the Hanoverian succession, 9 October 1712; CH2/840/2, 370-2, synod of Aberdcen, address to King George containing strong anti-Jacobite and pro-Hanoverian sentiments, 30 April 1716. In 1717 James Hart minister at Greyfriars in Edinburgh, a staunch anti-unionist in 1706, named his new born twins George and Wilhemina after the Prince and Princess of Wales, *The Correspondence of Robert Wodrow*, i, 359-360.

defend it, indeed they believed that faithfulness to God, King and country obliged them to, "cry aloud and spare not, when attempts are made, from whatsoever quarter, to wrest from us any of our valuable Privileges".¹⁴⁷ Much, indeed "All" was at stake and under such circumstances it was necessary that "All ought at All times to use their best endeavours for the safety of the Commonwealth". This was particularly evident during the '45. When government authority had collapsed and the British army had deserted its post the church provided badly needed leadership, ideological justification, spiritual encouragement and practical assistance.

Throughout the rebellion the church proved to be a bulwark against the prince. The pulpit and the numerous ministerial activities undermined and infuriated him in equal measure. Furthermore, he was caught between the proverbial rock and a hard place. A ruthless streak would have confirmed their prejudices while the lack of one failed to counter them. The '45 proved to be a watershed. Culloden dealt a fatal blow to Jacobite pretensions. Yes, for a number of years they continued to dream and scheme but the '45, was the end of the road in terms of a realistic chance of restoration. For the church the '45 had the effect of quickening its efforts to establish itself throughout the Highlands. There was an acknowledgement of the necessity of completing the work begun at the revolution. The work would take until the end of the eighteenth century and form part of a wider effort to incorporate the highlands into British society. By that time Jacobitism as a threat was dead and had been resurrected in the romantic, saccharine-coated culture of literature and song that even presbyterians could live with.

Dufftown

¹⁴⁷ Webster, *Heathens professing Judaism*, 12.